

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2 and 5-6 are canceled; Claims 1, 4 and 7 are amended.

Amended Claim 1 is supported at previously presented Claim 1, at specification page 11, lines 7-12, and at the Examples at specification pages 23 - 25. Amended Claim 4 is supported at previously presented Claims 1 and 4, the compatible features of Claim 1 being incorporated into Claim 4, at specification page 11, lines 7-12, and at specification pages 23 - 25. Amended Claim 7 is supported at previously presented Claim 7, at specification page 11, lines 7-12, and at specification pages 23 - 25.

No new matter is added.

Applicants thank Examiner Wilson for indicating that Claim 4 contains allowable subject matter. The indication of allowable subject matter is truly appreciated. Claim 4 is amended to be independent claim, to contain the compatible features of Claim 1, and to recite that  $n = 1$ .

The enablement rejection of Claim 1, 3-4, and 7-12 is traversed. In independent Claims 1 and 7 (and 4),  $n$  is amended to be 1. These amended claims, and their dependent claims, are definite.

The Office, at Official Action pages 3 and 4, in making the enablement rejection, focuses on situations where  $n$  is 2 or 3, or  $n$  is 2 to 20. For instance, the Office asserts there “is no direction or guidance presented for fluoranthene compounds where X is a radical of the instant formula (I’) wherein  $n$  is 2 or 3 or an oligophenyl group of instant formula (IV) where in  $n$  is 2 to 20.”<sup>1</sup> The Office further asserts there “is an absence of working examples concerning compounds where X is a radical of instant formula (I’) wherein  $n$  is 2 to 3 or an

---

<sup>1</sup> See Official Action page 3.

oligophenyl group of instant formula (IV) wherein *n* is 2 to 20.”<sup>2</sup> While not agreeing with or acceding to the Office’s enablement rejection arguments, and solely for the sake of expediting prosecution, Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 7 (and 4) to describe that n = 1. This amendment moots the Office’s arguments.

The subject matter of Claims 1 and 7 (and 4) is enabled, as shown for example, by representative inventive example 8-nonyl-9-octyl-7,10-diphenylfluoranthene, where X is alkyl and n is 1;<sup>3</sup> and by 9,9’dimethyl-7,10,7’,10’-tetraphenyl [8,8’]bifluoranthene, wherein X is a radical according to formula (I’) and R<sup>2</sup> is methyl.<sup>4</sup> The synthesis of these representative examples demonstrates that fluoranthenes in Claims 1 and 7 (and 4), and their dependent claims, can be readily synthesized without undue experimentation. Withdrawal of the enablement rejection is requested.

Applicants submit the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.  
J. Derek Mason



\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles J. Andres  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 57,537

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 07/09)

<sup>2</sup> Id. at page 4.

<sup>3</sup> See specification pages 22-23.

<sup>4</sup> Id. at page 25.